

Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION CORRECTED TRANSCRIPT

Title: Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Power Plant
License Renewal: Public Meeting
Afternoon Session

Docket Number: 50-348, 50-364

Location: Dothan, Alabama

Date: Thursday, September 30, 2004

Work Order No.: NRC-019

Pages 1-57

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.
Court Reporters and Transcribers
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 234-4433

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
JOSEPH M. FARLEY NUCLEAR POWER PLANT
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION
PRELIMINARY RESULTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

PUBLIC MEETING - AFTERNOON SESSION

SEPTEMBER 30, 2004

The meeting was held at 1:30 p.m. at the
Quality Inn, 3053 Ross Clark Circle, Dothan,
Alabama, Barry Zalzman, Facilitator, presiding.

PRESENT:

BARRY ZALCMAN, FACILITATOR

ANDREW KUGLER

JENNIFER DAVIS

CRYSTAL QUINLY

JACK CUSHING

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A-G-E-N-D-A

WELCOME - FACILITATOR ZALCMAN.....03

ANDREW KUGLER.....12

OVERVIEW OF LICENSE RENEWAL PROCESS

JENNIFER DAVIS.....21

RESULTS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

CRYSTAL QUINLY.....25

JACK CUSHING.....37

PUBLIC COMMENTS

MICHAEL STINSON.....48

WALTER HILL.....52

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(1:35 p.m.)

FACILITATOR ZALCMAN: Well, good afternoon, everybody. My name is Barry Zalcmán. I'm with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and serve as Program Manager. It's going to be my privilege today and honor to serve as your facilitator and hopefully we'll be able to have a meaningful meeting with meaningful interaction between you, the public, and the NRC staff.

Our job today as part of NRC staff interaction with you is to try and make sure that you get the information that you need to participate and provide us insights that you may have on the work of the Agency.

The subject for today's meeting is a license renewal application that was submitted by the Southern Nuclear Operating Company, for the Farley plant, Units 1 and 2, and particularly the environmental review that is part and parcel of the license renewal. We're going to be focusing on environmental issues today.

Today's format has two parts. In this first

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 part, the staff will give you background
2 information, give you insights as to the
3 structure of license renewal and how we
4 perform our renewal.

5 Then the second part of the meeting is
6 when we go out to you. It will be a formal
7 declaration as we begin that part of the
8 meeting and we'll be asking you to come and
9 share your views with us, if you have them at
10 that time.

11 There will be some question and answer
12 periods during the first part of the meeting
13 where we will have an opportunity to expand a
14 little further on some of the concerns that
15 you may have.

16 So, if you have questions during those
17 periods I'm going to allow the NRC staff to
18 complete portions of the presentation
19 and then I'm going to go out to
20 the audience. And then, if you have questions
21 of the staff, you can identify yourself and
22 I'll either come over and give you this
23 lavalier that you can talk to or you can come
24 up to the podium and ask the questions about
25 the process and the review completed to date.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Then, after the presentation by the staff,
2 again, we're going to come back to you and
3 give you an opportunity to share your views.

4 The staff will tell you a little more
5 about the license renewal process. We're
6 going to have a transcription of today's
7 meeting so that all the comments that you
8 make will actually become part of the record.
9 And with us today is Sue Martin taking the
10 transcript.

11 When we do have the opportunity for you
12 to come up and either ask a question or make
13 a presentation, I'm going to ask that you
14 identify yourself and tell us your
15 affiliation, if that's appropriate. We're
16 going to have the opportunity to interact and
17 I would like to have just one person speaking
18 at a time so that we can, number one, get a
19 clear transcript; number two, and more
20 importantly, so that we can give full
21 attention and respect to the individual
22 that's speaking at the time.

23 When you do have a question after the
24 staff presentation, I will just ask that you
25 identify yourself, raise your right-hand,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we'll come over; eye contact, we'll come
2 over.

3 When we get to the second part there are
4 some folks that have pre-registered to speak.
5 First, what I will do is give the opportunity to
6 the applicant or representative of the
7 applicant to make a presentation, and then
8 those who are pre-registered in advance, and
9 then the rest of you, if you have comments.

10 Some of you may just be here to collect
11 information and take it back. During the course
12 of our presentation we will give you some
13 insight as to how you can share your views
14 with us after the meeting.

15 I would ask when we do have the
16 opportunity for your comments if you could be
17 brief and concise, try and limit it to about
18 five to seven minutes. If you do have
19 prepared remarks then we'll be happy to take
20 them. You can either provide us with a
21 synopsis and put the full remarks on the
22 record or, if you want to read it, you can also
23 share a copy with us and we'll put it in the
24 record.

25 For those of you that are comfortable

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 enough to come up to the podium you can make
2 your presentation there. Those of you that
3 would prefer to sit in your seat can make it
4 from there. I will be happy to come over
5 with the microphone.

6 In terms of the agenda today, all of you
7 should have received one as you came in, the
8 opportunity to register. If you don't have
9 one, please identify yourself and we'll get
10 one to you. Amy Barrett is helping up
11 at the registration desk. Hopefully, all of
12 you have copies of not only the agenda but
13 also copies of the slides, as well.

14 Once again, NRC is going to provide a
15 brief overview of the entire review license
16 renewal process, both the safety activities, as well
17 as the environmental activities. We're then
18 going to give you a little description of the
19 specific attributes of the review itself and
20 the preliminary findings and conclusions of
21 the staff and environmental team.

22 At the end of the staff presentation
23 we'll give you some details on the schedule
24 for the balance of the review, as well as how
25 you can interact with the staff and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 communicate with the staff with your
2 comments.

3 So with that, let me take a few moments
4 to introduce the speakers to you. The first
5 one we're going to have today is Mr. Andy
6 Kugler. Mr. Kugler is the Chief of the
7 Environmental Impact Section in the Office of
8 Nuclear Reactor Regulation at the NRC.

9 It's Andy's group that leads all the
10 environmental reviews for any significant
11 action for the Agency dealing with reactors;
12 that's both power reactors and non-power reactors.
13 So not only is it license renewal but all
14 other licensing actions such as, power upgrades.
15 All of the environmental work is done under
16 Andy's supervision today.

17 Andy and his contractors from National
18 Labs were responsible for developing the
19 draft environmental impact statement that is
20 the subject of today's meeting.

21 Andy did his undergraduate work at
22 Cooper Union which is in New York in mechanical
23 engineering; has done his graduate work in
24 technical management at Johns Hopkins
25 University in Maryland. He has over

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 twenty-five years of experience. Some work
2 for the U.S. Navy. Some at the River Bend
3 Plant also in the south. And joined the
4 Agency over ten years ago and was a safety
5 project manager, and more recently, an
6 environmental project manager working on
7 license renewal, as well.

8 He clearly has a very deep understanding
9 not only of the environmental issues but also
10 of the safety issues associated with the
11 license renewal and plant operations. After
12 that we'll go to Jennifer Davis.

12:43P

13 After Mr. Kugler we'll go to Jenny
14 Davis. Jenny will provide a general
15 discussion of the environmental review, what
16 we do and the process that we have. Jenny
17 has come to us after several years of
18 experience in both the private sector as well
19 as the academic sector. She has a background
20 in historic preservation, classical
21 civilization, as well as archaeology.

22 She had her undergraduate work at Mary
23 Washington College and is the point person
24 today for the Office of Nuclear Reactor
25 Regulation dealing with the National Historic

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Preservation Act.

2 After that we'll go to Crystal Quinly.
3 Crystal is the project team leader for us in
4 that she coordinates and orchestrates the
5 activities of the National Lab technical
6 assistance that we have working on this
7 project.

8 The NRC staff has technical experts that
9 come to us from Lawrence Livermore and Los
10 Alamos National Laboratory, both of which are
11 operated by the University of California, as
12 well as some specialists from the Pacific
13 Northwest National Laboratory, which is
14 operated by Battelle Memorial Institute.

15 Crystal is part of the environmental
16 evaluations group at Livermore, has a
17 technical background in environmental science
18 with a focus on land use and she got her
19 Bachelor's of Arts degree in environmental
20 science at California State University at
21 Hayward, California in 1994.

22 She also has over ten years experience
23 working with environmental issues in the
24 private sector, as well as with Livermore and
25 the work under the Department of Energy.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Finally we're going to have a
2 presentation by Jack Cushing. Jack is a
3 Senior Environmental Project Manager and is
4 the Project Manager for this activity. He's
5 going to provide a very brief discussion on
6 Severe accident analysis work that is part of
7 this environmental review. Then he is going
8 to go into some of the details on how you the
9 public can share your insights with us and
10 how we can capture the material that you are
11 willing to send in as comments on the
12 document.

13 We'll give you some discussion of the
14 schedule and also talk about a feedback form
15 that we would like you to consider filling
16 out to help us improve the process for
17 interactions with the public.

18 Jack is a Senior Environmental Project
19 Manager. He did his undergraduate work in
20 Marine Engineering at Massachusetts Maritime
21 Academy. Jack was a licensed reactor
22 operator for fifteen years so he can actually
23 operate one of these plants we're talking
24 about. He joined the NRC about five years
25 ago and then joined the environmental group,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 so Jack is currently the environmental project
2 manager for the Farley project and also the first-
3 of-a-kind early site permit. So, not only is he
4 working in the license renewal arena but
5 he's also working in the ESP arena, as well.

6 In addition to the four presenters that I
7 talked about during the course of the staff's
8 presentation, we'll also introduce other NRC
9 folks that are here that may assist them in
10 responding to some of those questions that
11 you may have.

12 So, with that as the background, the
13 formal discussion on the background of the
14 individuals, we're going to hand it over to
15 Mr. Kugler. And with that, I thank you for
16 taking the time in this afternoon to share
17 your interactions with us and let Mr. Kugler
18 take it away.

19 MR. KUGLER: Thank you, Barry. And thank
20 you all for coming out here today to
21 participate in this meeting. I hope that the
22 information that we provide today will help
23 you to understand the process that we're
24 going through, to understand where we are
25 today in that process, and the role

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that you can play in helping us to ensure
2 that the final document that we prepare is
3 accurate.

4 First, let me provide some general
5 context for the license renewal process. The
6 Atomic Energy Act gives the NRC the authority
7 to issue operating licenses to nuclear power
8 plants for a period of forty years. For
9 Farley Units 1 and 2, those operating
10 licenses expire in the years 2017 and 2021,
11 respectively.

12 Our regulations also provide for twenty
13 year extensions to those licenses. And the
14 Southern Nuclear Company has applied for
15 renewal for the Farley Units 1 and 2.

16 As part of the NRC's review of the
17 license renewal application, we performed an
18 environmental review to evaluate the impact
19 of another twenty years of operation on the
20 environment. We held a meeting here last
21 January as an early part of that process to
22 gather information from you on the scope of
23 our review.

24 As we indicated at that time, we're
25 returning now to explain what we found in our

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 review, in the Draft Environmental Impact
2 Statement, and to give you an opportunity to
3 ask questions and to provide comments on that
4 draft.

5 Before I get into the discussion of the
6 license renewal process itself, I would like
7 to take a minute to talk about the NRC in
8 terms of what we do and what our mission is.

9 As I mentioned, the Atomic Energy Act is
10 The legislation that authorizes the NRC to
11 regulate the civilian uses of nuclear
12 material.

13 In exercising that authority, our mission
14 is three-fold. One of our jobs is to protect
15 the public health and safety. We also
16 protect the environment and we provide for
17 the common defense and security.

18 The NRC accomplishes its mission through
19 a combination of regulatory programs and
20 processes such as inspections, enforcement
21 actions, assessments of licensee performance
22 and evaluation of operating experience at
23 nuclear plants throughout the country.

24 Turning now to the license renewal
25 process itself, our review is similar to the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 original licensing process for the plants in
2 that there are two tracks. There is a safety
3 review and there's an environmental review.

4 The safety review includes safety
5 evaluation, audits and on-site inspections
6 and an independent review by the Advisory
7 Committee on Reactor Safeguards, which you
8 will often hear us refer to as ACRS.

9 There are two types of safety issues that
10 we have to deal with. There are current
11 issues. These are dealt with on a day-to-day
12 basis today. Then there are aging management
13 issues which we'll address in the license
14 renewal process.

15 Under the current operating license the
16 NRC's regulatory oversight process deals with
17 current issues. We don't plan to wait if
18 there's a current issue and wait for a
19 license renewal application to deal with it.
20 We'll deal with it today.

21 Because some of these issues are being
22 dealt with today, for example, security and
23 emergency planning, and they're dealt with on
24 an ongoing basis, we don't reevaluate them
25 under the license renewal review.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Instead, the license renewal review
2 focuses on the aging management issues and
3 programs that the licensing has implemented
4 or will implement to manage the aging of
5 equipment and components. The results of
6 that are documented in the Safety Evaluation
7 Report.

8 As I mentioned, that report will then be
9 independently reviewed by the Advisory
10 Committee on Reactor Safeguards. This
11 committee is an independent organization that
12 is made up of nationally recognized technical
13 experts in nuclear safety and they serve as a
14 consulting body to the commission.

15 They review each license renewal
16 application and they review our safety
17 evaluation report. They come to their own
18 conclusions and recommendations and then they
19 provide those directly to the commission.

20 The environmental review, which Ms. Davis
21 will discuss in more detail in a few minutes,
22 evaluates the impact of license renewal in a
23 number of areas. These are issues such as
24 hydrology, ecology, cultural resources, and
25 socioeconomic issues, among others.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Now this slide gives an overview of the
2 entire license renewal process. As I
3 discussed, there are really two tracks; the
4 upper portion of this is the safety review
5 and the lower portion is the environmental
6 review. The safety review involves the NRC
7 staff review and assessment of the safety
8 information as contained in the licensee's
9 application.

10 There's a team of about thirty technical
11 reviewers working for the NRC either at
12 headquarters or as contractors who are
13 conducting that safety review.

14 I would like to introduce the Safety
15 Project Manager. Her name is Tilda Liu and
16 she is here with us today. Tilda, if you
17 could just stand up for a moment. Tilda is
18 leading the safety review.

19 The safety review will focus on the
20 effectiveness of the aging management
21 programs for the plant's systems and
22 structures that are within the scope of
23 license renewal. We review the effectiveness
24 of these programs to ensure that the plant
25 can be safely operated during the period of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 extended operation.

2 The safety review process also involves
3 audits and on-site inspections. These
4 inspections are conducted by teams of
5 inspectors brought together from both our
6 headquarters and from our regional offices.
7 There are representatives of our inspection
8 program here today.

9 In particular, the senior resident
10 inspector at the Farley plant Charles
11 Patterson is here today. Charles, if you
12 could. Thank you.

13 He is also assisted at the plant by the
14 resident inspector Rodney Fanner who I don't
15 believe he is with us today. No.

16 The results of the inspections are
17 documented in separate inspection
18 reports and these results combined with the
19 results of the staff's review of the aging
20 management program are documented in the
21 safety evaluation report which we provided to
22 the ACRS for their review.

23 The last of the on-site inspections is
24 underway right now. And in fact, the exit
25 meeting for that inspection will be held

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 tomorrow at the Houston County Commissioners'
2 Chambers at nine o'clock in the morning.

3 We're also in the process of developing a
4 Safety Evaluation Report.

5 The second part of the review process is
6 the environmental review which includes
7 scoping activities and the development of a
8 Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

9 The Draft Environmental Impact Statement
10 is a supplement to the Generic Environmental
11 Impact Statement for license renewal of
12 nuclear power plants, also referred by us
13 often as the GEIS G-E-I-S.

14 The Draft Environmental Impact Statement
15 has been published for comment and we're here
16 today to briefly discuss the results and
17 receive your comments.

18 In March of next year we expect to issue
19 the Final Environmental Impact Statement,
20 which will address the comments that we
21 receive here today and any comments we
22 receive in writing during the comment period.

23 So as you can see from the slide, the
24 final Agency decision on whether or not to
25 approve the application requires a number of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 things to be done. There has to be a Safety
2 Evaluation Report which documents results of
3 our safety review, an environmental impact
4 statement to document the environmental
5 review, the inspection report and the
6 independent report by the Advisory Committee
7 on Reactor Safeguards.

8 I would like to point out the splash
9 marks on the screen. These indicate places
10 where there are opportunities for public
11 involvement.

12 During scoping we were here in January
13 for meetings and we also -- there was also an
14 opportunity for the public to provide written
15 comments.

16 During the comment period on the draft
17 which we're in now, we hold the meetings here
18 again and also you have the opportunity to
19 provide written comments. You will see there
20 is one over here for hearings on the far
21 right. Nobody requested a hearing so that
22 really doesn't apply in this review.

23 And finally, when the ACRS holds its
24 meetings, those meetings are open to the
25 public.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Now I would like to turn things over to
2 Ms. Davis to discuss the environmental
3 review, in particular. Thank you.

4 MS. DAVIS: Thank you. As Andy said, my
5 name is Jennifer Davis. I'm the back up
6 environmental project manager for the Farley
7 license renewal review.

8 I would like to discuss in more detail
9 today the environmental review. The reason
10 we conduct an environmental review is because
11 of the National Environmental Policy Act or
12 NEPA, as it's commonly known.

13 NEPA requires a systematic approach in
14 evaluating the impacts of proposed major
15 federal actions. Consideration is given to
16 impacts of the proposed action and mitigation
17 of any impact believed to be significant.

18 Alternatives to the proposed action,
19 including taking no action on the application,
20 are also considered. Our environmental
21 impact statement is a disclosure tool which
22 involves public participation.

23 The Commission has determined that for
24 all license renewals an Environmental Impact
25 Statement will be prepared.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Now this slide contains some rather
2 confusing language but to put it simply, our
3 decision standard basically states are the
4 environmental impacts of the proposed action
5 great enough that maintaining the license
6 renewal option of the Farley Units 1 and 2
7 unreasonable.

8 Now this slide is just a general overview,
9 an expansion of what Andy had up earlier
10 and basically it's detailing the bottom part
11 of that slide. And basically, this is where
12 we stand in the process.

13 Southern Nuclear submitted their
14 application to the NRC on September 15th,
15 2003. In December of that same year we
16 issued a *Federal Register* notice of intent to
17 Prepare an environmental impact statement and conduct
18 Scoping.

19 Now you may ask what is scoping. Scoping
20 is a process whereby we receive comments from
21 interested members of the public to help us
22 scope out the bounds of our environmental
23 review for various disciplines that we
24 consider.

25 We also conducted an environmental site

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 audit. The NRC along with our team members
2 and environmental experts came out to the
3 site in January. In that same week we also
4 held a public scoping meeting here in this
5 room. Many of you may have attended those
6 meetings and provided us comments.

7 All comments received during those
8 meetings and during the scoping phase are
9 included in the scoping summary report. All
10 comments regarding this environmental review
11 in particular are included in Appendix A of
12 the Draft Environmental Impact Statement,
13 which we're here to discuss today.

14 During the review we determined that we
15 needed additional information, so in December
16 we sent a formal request for additional
17 information to the licensee. We took that
18 information along with information received
19 during the scoping process and performed an
20 independent evaluation on the environmental
21 issues.

22 We then published the Draft Environmental
23 Impact Statement. Our draft is a supplement
24 to the Generic Environmental Impact Statement
25 or GEIS as Andy described earlier.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The GEIS evaluates environmental issues
2 common to all nuclear power plants throughout
3 the country.

4 Our meeting today is to present our
5 preliminary findings and to gather comments
6 on this draft EIS. Once we receive your
7 comments we will go back, address your
8 comments, make any changes as necessary to
9 the document and in March of 2005 prepare to
10 issue our final environmental impact
11 statements regarding Farley.

12 And that concludes my remarks. And if
13 there's anything else.

14 FACILITATOR ZALCMAN: Thank you, Jenny
15 and Andy. We just completed the front end of
16 the staff's presentation. We've talked at a high
17 level about the process for license renewal
18 and particularly the environmental review and
19 this probably represents the first good stop
20 in the presentation to ask whether or not you
21 have questions of the staff.

22 We will be getting to the details of the
23 environmental impact statement in the next
24 two presenters of the material but are there
25 any questions about the process either on the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 safety side or on the environmental side?

2 I'm sure the staff is prepared to respond.

3 Okay. If not, let me hand it over to Ms.
4 Quinly.

5 MS. QUINLY: Good afternoon. As
6 Barry said, I work for the University of
7 California at Lawrence Livermore National
8 Lab. The NRC contracted with us to provide
9 the expertise necessary to evaluate the
10 impact of license renewal at Farley.

11 The environmental review team consists of
12 nine members from Lawrence Livermore National
13 Laboratory, Los Alamos National Laboratory in
14 New Mexico and Pacific Northwest National
15 Laboratory in Washington.

16 The expertise we provided for the plant
17 relicensing and for alternatives are shown on
18 the screen. Atmospheric science.
19 Socioeconomics and environmental justice.
20 Archeology. Terrestrial ecology. Aquatic
21 ecology. Land use. Radiation Protection.
22 Hydrology. Nuclear safety and regulatory
23 compliance.

24 The Generic Environmental Impact
25 Statement for license renewal, the GEIS,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 identifies 92 environmental issues that are
2 evaluated for license renewal. 69 of these
3 issues are considered generic or category one
4 which means that the impacts are common to
5 all reactors or common to all reactors with
6 certain features, such as plants that have
7 cooling towers.

8 For the other 23 issues referred to as
9 category two, the NRC found that the impacts
10 were not the same at all sites and therefore
11 site specific analysis was needed.

12 Only certain issues addressed in the GEIS
13 are applicable to Farley because of the
14 design and location of the plant. For those
15 generic issues that are applicable to Farley
16 we assessed if there was any new information
17 related to the issues that might change the
18 conclusion in the GEIS.

19 If there is no new information, then the
20 conclusions of the GEIS was adopted. If new
21 information is identified and determined to
22 be significant then a site specific analysis
23 would be performed.

24 For the site specific issues related to
25 Farley, a site specific analysis was

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 performed.

2 Finally, during the scoping period the
3 public was invited to provide information on
4 potential new issues, and the team during its
5 review, also looked to see if there were any
6 new issues that needed to be evaluated.

7 For each environmental issue identified,
8 an impact level is assigned. For a small
9 impact, the effect is not detectable or too
10 small to destabilize or noticeably alter any
11 important attribute of the resource.

12 For example, the operation of the Farley
13 plant may cause the loss of adult and
14 juvenile fish at the intake structure. If
15 the loss of fish is so small that it cannot
16 be detected in relation to the total
17 population in the river, the impact would be
18 small.

19 For a moderate impact, the effect is
20 sufficient to alter noticeably but not
21 destabilize important attributes of the
22 resource.

23 Again, for example, if the losses cause
24 the population to decline and then stabilize
25 at a lower level, the impact would be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 moderate.

2 And for an impact to be considered large,
3 the effect must be clearly noticeable and
4 sufficient to destabilize important
5 attributes of the resource.

6 The final example is if losses at the
7 intake cause the fish population to decline
8 to the point it cannot be stabilized and
9 continually declines, then the impact would
10 be large.

11 When the Farley team, environmental
12 review team evaluated the impacts from
13 continued operations of Farley, we considered
14 information from a wide variety of sources.
15 We considered what the licensee had to say in
16 their environmental report. We conducted a
17 site audit during which we toured the site,
18 interviewed plant personnel and reviewed
19 documentation of plant operations.

20 We also talked to federal, state, and
21 local officials, as well as local service
22 agencies.

23 Lastly, we considered all of the comments
24 received from the public during the scoping
25 meeting. These comments are listed in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Appendix A, along with NCR's responses.

2 This body of information is the basis for
3 the analysis and preliminary conclusions of
4 the Farley supplement.

5 The central analyses in the Farley
6 supplement are presented in chapters two,
7 four, five and eight.

8 In chapter two we discuss the plant, its
9 operations and the environment around the
10 plant. In chapter four we looked at the
11 environmental impact of routine operations in
12 the twenty year license renewal term.

13 The team looked at issues related to
14 cooling systems, transmission lines,
15 radiological, socioeconomic, ground water use
16 and quality, threatened or endangered species
17 and accidents.

18 Chapter five contains the assessment of
19 accidents.

20 At this point I would like to make a
21 distinction. Environmental impacts from the
22 routine, day-to-day operation of the Farley
23 plant for another twenty years are considered
24 separately from the impacts that result from
25 the potential accidents during the license

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 renewal term.

2 I will discuss impacts from routine
3 operations. Mr. Cushing will discuss impacts
4 from accidents in the next presentation.

5 Chapter eight discusses the alternatives
6 to the proposed license renewal and their
7 environmental impacts. Each of these issue
8 areas are discussed in detail in the Farley
9 supplement. I'm going to give you the
10 highlights but please feel free to ask me for
11 details.

12 One of the issues we looked at closely is
13 cooling system for the Farley plant. This
14 slide shows cooling system process. The
15 issues that the team looked at on a site
16 specific basis included water use conflicts
17 and microbiological organisms. We found that
18 the potential impacts in these areas were
19 small and additional mitigation is not
20 needed.

21 There are also a number of category one
22 issues related to the cooling system. These
23 include issues related to discharges of
24 sanitary waste, minor chemical spills, metals
25 and chlorine.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Now recall that as category one issues,
2 NRC already determined that these impacts
3 were small. The team evaluated all of the
4 information we had available to see if there
5 was any that was both new and significant for
6 these issues. We did not find any and
7 therefore we adopted the NRC's generic
8 conclusions that the impact of the cooling
9 system is small.

10 Radiological impacts are a category one
11 issue and the NRC made a generic
12 determination that the impact of radiological
13 release during nuclear plant operations
14 during the twenty year license renewal period
15 are small. But because these releases are a
16 concern, I wanted to discuss them in some
17 detail.

18 All nuclear plants release small
19 quantities of radioactive materials within
20 strict regulation. During our site visit we
21 looked at the release and monitoring program
22 documentation. We looked at how these gases
23 and liquid effluents were treated and
24 released, as well as how the solid wastes
25 were treated, packaged and shipped.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We looked at how the applicant determines
2 and demonstrates that they are within
3 compliance with the regulations for release
4 of radiological effluents.

5 We also looked at data from onsite and
6 near-site locations that the applicant
7 monitors for airborne releases and direct
8 radiation and other monitoring stations
9 beyond the site boundary, including locations
10 where water, milk, fish and food products are
11 sampled.

12 We found that the maximum calculated
13 doses for a member of the public are well
14 within the annual limits. Now there is a
15 near unanimous consensus within the
16 scientific community that these limits are
17 protective of human health.

18 Since releases from this plant are not
19 expected to increase on a year to year basis
20 during the twenty year license renewal term
21 and since we also found no new and
22 significant information related to this
23 issue, we adopted the generic conclusion that
24 the radiological impact on human health and
25 the environment is small.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 There are seven aquatic species and
2 eighteen terrestrial species listed as
3 threatened, endangered or candidate species
4 that could occur in the range of the Farley
5 site and the transmission lines.

6 A detailed biological assessment
7 analyzing the effects of continuing operation
8 and relicensing of Farley was prepared and is
9 included in Appendix E of the Farley
10 supplement. Based on this and additional
11 independent analysis, the staff's preliminary
12 determination is that the impact of operation
13 of the Farley plant during the license
14 renewal period on threatened or endangered
15 species would be small.

16 The last issue I would like to talk about
17 from chapter four is cumulative impacts.
18 These impacts may be minor when considered
19 individually but could be significant when
20 considered with other past, present or
21 reasonably foreseeable future actions,
22 regardless of what other agency or person
23 undertakes the other actions.

24 The staff considers cumulative impacts
25 resulting from operation of cooling water

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 system, operation of the transmission lines,
2 releases of radiation or radiological
3 material, sociological impact, groundwater
4 use and quality impacts, and threatened or
5 endangered species.

6 These impacts were evaluated to the end
7 of the twenty year license renewal term and I
8 would like to note that the geographical
9 boundary of the analysis was dependent upon
10 the resource. For example, the area analyzed
11 for transmission lines was different than the
12 area analyzed for the cooling water system.

13 Our preliminary determination is that any
14 cumulative impacts resulting from the
15 operation of the Farley plant during the
16 license renewal period would be small.

17 The team also looked at these other
18 environmental impacts. All issues for
19 uranium fuel cycle and solid waste management
20 as well as decommissioning are considered
21 category one.

22 For these issues no new and significant
23 information was identified.

24 In 2001, Farley generated about 13.7
25 million megawatts of electricity. The team

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 also evaluated the potential environmental
2 impacts associated with the Farley plant not
3 continuing operation and replacing this
4 generation with alternative power resources.

5 The team looked at the no action
6 alternative; that is the unit is not
7 relicensed. New generation from coal-fired,
8 gas-fired, new nuclear, purchase power,
9 alternative technology such as wind, solar
10 and hydro power and a combination of
11 alternatives.

12 For each alternative we looked at the
13 same type of issues -- for example, water
14 use, land use, ecology and socioeconomics --
15 that we looked at for the operation of Farley
16 during the license renewal term.

17 For two alternatives, solar and wind, I
18 would like to describe the scale of the
19 alternative because the scale is important in
20 understanding our conclusions.

21 First, solar. Based on the average solar
22 energy available in Alabama and Georgia and
23 the current conversion efficiencies of solar
24 cells, these cells would produce about 146
25 kilowatts per square meter per year. As

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 such, about 94 million square meters or about
2 36 square miles of cells would be required to
3 replace the generation from the Farley plant.

4 Regarding wind power, Alabama and Florida
5 do not have sufficient wind resources to use
6 large scale wind turbines but Georgia has
7 good wind resources in the uppermost portion
8 of the state.

9 However, even exploring the full
10 resources for all three states, the
11 generation would replace less than four
12 percent of the generation of Farley.

13 Due to the scale of reasonable
14 alternatives, the team's preliminary
15 conclusion is that their environmental
16 effects in at least some impact categories
17 reach moderate or large significance.

18 So in 1996 the NRC reached generic
19 conclusions for 69 issues related to
20 operating nuclear plants for another twenty
21 years.

22 For category one issues, the team looked
23 to see if there was any information both new
24 and significant and whether or not we could
25 adopt the generic conclusions.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 For the remaining category two issues,
2 the team performed an analysis specific for
3 the Farley site. During our review the team
4 found no new issues that were not already
5 known.

6 Of the category one issues that apply to
7 Farley, we found no information that was both
8 new and significant, therefore, we have
9 preliminarily adopted the conclusions that
10 the impact of these issues are small.

11 The team analyzed the remaining category
12 two issues in the supplement and found the
13 environmental effects resulting from these
14 issues were also small.

15 Again, during our review the team found
16 no new issues.

17 Last we found that the environmental
18 effects of alternatives, at least in some
19 impact categories, reach moderate or large
20 significance.

21 Now I would like to turn this over to Mr.
22 Cushing.

23 MR. CUSHING: Thank you, Crystal. As
24 Crystal said, my name is Jack Cushing and I'm
25 the Environmental Project Manager for the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Farley license renewal project and I will be
2 discussing the environmental impact of
3 postulated accidents.

4 These impacts are discussed in chapter
5 five of the Generic Environmental Impact
6 Statement or the GEIS.

7 The GEIS evaluates two classes of
8 accidents; design basis accidents and severe
9 accidents.

10 Design basis accidents are those
11 accidents that both the licensee and the NRC
12 staff evaluated during the initial licensing
13 and on an ongoing basis to ensure that the
14 plant can safely respond to a broad spectrum
15 of postulated accidents without undo risk to
16 the public.

17 The environmental impacts of those design
18 basis accidents was also evaluated because
19 the plant has to demonstrate on an ongoing
20 basis the design is still capable of meeting
21 the design basis accidents.

22 The Commission has determined that the
23 environmental impacts of design basis
24 accidents are small.

25 Neither the licensee nor the NRC is aware

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of any new or significant information on the
2 capability of the Farley plant to withstand
3 design basis accidents. Therefore, the staff
4 concludes that there are no impacts related
5 to design basis accidents beyond those
6 discussed in the Generic Environmental Impact
7 Statement.

8 The second category of accidents
9 evaluated in the Generic Environmental Impact
10 Statement are severe accidents. Severe
11 accidents by definition are more severe than
12 design basis accidents because they could
13 result in substantial damage to the reactor.

14 The Commission found in the GEIS that the
15 risk of severe accidents is small for all
16 plants. Nevertheless, the Commission
17 determined that alternatives to mitigate
18 severe accidents must be considered for all
19 plants that have not already done so.

20 We refer to these alternatives as severe
21 Accidents mitigation alternatives or SAMA for
22 short. The SAMA evaluation is a site
23 specific evaluation.

24 The SAMA review for Farley is summarized
25 in section 5.2 of the supplement to the GEIS

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and in more detail in Appendix G.

2 The purpose of performing the SAMA
3 evaluation is to ensure that the plant
4 changes to prevent or mitigate severe
5 accidents are identified and evaluated.

6 The scope includes SAMAs that would
7 prevent core damage, as well as damage that
8 improved containment performance given an
9 event occurs.

10 The scope of potential plant improvements
11 that were considered, included hardware
12 modifications, procedure changes, training
13 program improvements, basically a broad
14 spectrum of potential changes.

15 The SAMA evaluation process is a four
16 step process. The first step is to
17 characterize overall plant risks and the
18 leading contributors to plant risks. This
19 involves extensive use of the plant specific
20 probabilistic risk assessment study, which is
21 also known as the PRA.

22 The PRA is a study that evaluates
23 different combinations of system failures and
24 human errors that are required for an
25 accident to progress to either core damage or

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 containment failure.

2 The second step in the evaluation is to
3 identify potential improvements that could
4 further reduce risk. The information for the
5 PRA is used to help identify plant
6 improvements that would have the greatest
7 impact on reducing risk.

8 Improvements identified in other NRC
9 studies and in other industry studies are
10 also considered.

11 The third step in the evaluation is to
12 quantify the risk reduction potential and the
13 implementation cost for each improvement.

14 The risk reduction and the implementation
15 cost using SAMA are estimated using a bounding
16 analysis, that is, the risk reduction is
17 generally overestimated and assumes that the
18 plant improvement would totally eliminate the
19 risk of that accident sequence.

20 The implementation costs are underestimated
21 and certain costs such as
22 maintenance and surveillance costs are not
23 considered. The risk reduction and cost
24 assessments are then used in the final step
25 to determine whether implementation of any of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the improvements can be justified.

2 In determining whether an improvement is
3 justified, the NRC staff looks at three
4 factors. The first is whether the
5 improvement is cost beneficial. In other
6 words, is the estimated benefit greater than
7 the estimated implementation cost of the
8 SAMA.

9 The second factor is whether the
10 improvement produces a significant reduction
11 in overall plant risk, for example, does it
12 eliminate a sequence or a containment failure
13 mode that contributes to a large fraction of
14 plant risk.

15 The third factor is whether the risk
16 reduction is associated with an aging effect
17 during the period of extended operation. In
18 which case if it was we would consider
19 implementation as part of the license renewal
20 process.

21 The preliminary results of the Farley
22 SAMA evaluation are summarized on this slide.

23 124 candidate improvements were
24 identified for Farley based on the review of
25 the Plant Specific Probabilistic Risk

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Assessments and studies on severe accidents
2 and SAMA analyses performed for other plants.

3 This was reduced to a set of twenty-one
4 potential SAMAs based on a multi-step
5 screening process. Factors considered during
6 this screening process included whether the
7 SAMA was applicable to the Farley design
8 or whether it had already been addressed in the existing Farley
9 design procedures or training program.

10 A more detailed assessment of the design
11 and cost was then performed for each of the
12 twenty-one remaining SAMAs. This is
13 described in detail in Appendix G of the GEIS supplement.

14 The cost benefit shows that three of the
15 SAMAs are potentially cost beneficial when
16 evaluated in accordance with NRC guidance for
17 performance regulatory analysis.

18 The cost beneficial SAMAs involved
19 increasing the charging pump lube oil
20 capacity by adding supplemental lube oil
21 reservoir for each charging pump; hardware
22 and procedure modifications for the use of
23 the existing hydro test pump for the RCP seal
24 injection, and finally, developing a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 procedure to permit local, manual operation
2 of the feedwater pump when control power is
3 lost, while the plant improvement further
4 mitigates severe accidents they are not required
5 as part of the license renewal because they
6 do not relate to managing the effects of
7 aging during the license renewal process.

8 However, Southern Nuclear Company stated
9 that they plan to implement the
10 feedwater SAMA and are evaluating the other
11 two SAMAs for implementation.

12 Now I would like to take a moment and go
13 over our overall conclusions for our
14 environmental review. And in that review we
15 found that the impacts of license renewal are
16 small in all impact areas.

17 This conclusion is preliminary in the
18 case of threatened or endangered species
19 pending conclusion of our consultation with
20 the Fish and Wildlife Service.

21 We also concluded that the alternative
22 action, including the no action alternative,
23 may have environmental effects in at least
24 some impact categories to reach moderate or
25 large significance.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Based on these results, our preliminary
2 recommendation is that the adverse
3 environmental impacts of license renewal for
4 Farley Units 1 and 2 are not so great that
5 preserving the option of license renewal for
6 energy planning and decision makers would be
7 unreasonable.

8 Now I would like to share some upcoming
9 milestones with you. We issued the Draft
10 Environmental Impact Statement on August 6th,
11 2004. We're in the middle of our comment
12 period, which runs from August 13th to
13 November 5th. And we expect to gather all
14 the comments, the ones we receive at this
15 meeting and any that we may receive in the
16 mail or through e-mail, and then address them
17 and issue our Final Environmental Impact
18 Statement in March of 2005.

19 Now I just want to give you some means of
20 getting a hold of us and in case you have any
21 comments or think of something after the
22 meeting you can call me at the phone number
23 provided. And if you would like to read the
24 Draft Environmental Impact Statement, we do
25 have copies in the back and they are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 available at the Houston Memorial Library and
2 the Lucy Maddox Memorial Library.

3 In addition, the draft EIS is available
4 on the NRC's website at www.nrc.gov.

5 Now the purpose of this meeting is to get
6 your comments on the Draft Environmental
7 Impact Statement. And there are three ways
8 to do that outside of this meeting. In the
9 meeting where it's being transcribed so we
10 will capture any of your comments. Outside
11 of the meeting you can mail your comments to
12 the address on the slide. If you happen to
13 be in Rockville, Maryland for any reason you
14 can drop them off in person. And an easier
15 way is for you to e-mail them to us at
16 FarleyEIS@nrc.gov.

17 I would also like to take a moment to
18 mention that we have a public information
19 feedback form, that you should have received when
20 you came in. And if
21 you have time, could you fill it out and
22 drop it off on the way out or you can
23 mail it to us. We appreciate getting some feedback
24 so we can improve our meetings.

25 I would like to thank everyone for taking

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the time out of your day to come and hear our
2 presentation and we're interested in hearing
3 your comments.

4 FACILITATOR ZALCMAN: Thank you, Jack and
5 again, Crystal. This is the second break
6 that we have where we can respond to any
7 questions you have. The first was on the
8 general overview and the processes.

9 This is now an opportunity to respond to
10 any questions that you may have regarding the
11 process for this review, the specific
12 document that was prepared by the staff, as
13 well as what steps you can take after this
14 meeting is over to communicate with us, offer
15 your comments in written form. I'm sure the
16 staff is ready and prepared to respond to any
17 questions.

18 I'm not seeing any. Thank you very much
19 for listening to the staff and the
20 presentation. What we will do now is go into
21 the second part of today's meeting, where
22 the staff is now prepared to formally accept
23 any comments that you are prepared to make
24 today.

25 We have a couple of folks that have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 pre-registered. The first will be the
2 representative of the applicant. That will
3 be Michael Stinson. And I will give him the
4 floor. And we do have one other person that
5 is pre-registered and see if others have an
6 interest to speak. Whether you have
7 registered you will have an opportunity to
8 share your views.

1:27P

9 MR. STINSON: Good afternoon. My name is
10 Mike Stinson. I'm vice-president of the
11 Farley plant. The Farley Nuclear plant and I
12 appreciate the opportunity to speak to you
13 today. I want to begin by giving you a
14 little background information about myself.

15 I've been with the Southern Company for
16 more than thirty years. Most of that time
17 was spent here at Plant Farley in the Dothan
18 area. My wife and I raised our family here.
19 We have many friends here and are very
20 concerned about any potential effects that
21 Plant Farley might have on the environment
22 and this community.

23 I started working at Plant Farley in 1972
24 during the construction phase. Throughout my
25 career I've held various positions at the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 plant, including numerous engineering,
2 supervisory and management positions. I also
3 received a senior reactor operator's license
4 while here at Farley.

5 Prior to becoming vice-president I served
6 as the General Manager of Plant Farley here
7 in Dothan and the General Manager of Nuclear
8 Support in Birmingham. I share this with you
9 because I want to give you some perspective
10 about my affiliation with this plant and my
11 experience in the nuclear industry.

12 Also, I want to thank the NRC for what I
13 believe to be a very complete review. The
14 Agency has put much time and effort in
15 conducting this review. I believe it to be
16 thorough and comprehensive.

17 Furthermore, the conclusions the
18 Commission reached are consistent with the
19 Plant Farley environmental report conclusions
20 we reached for license renewal.

21 We wouldn't be going through this
22 process in pursuit of license renewal if we
23 didn't feel as a company that it's the right
24 thing to do. And I wouldn't be promoting it
25 personally if I didn't feel it was the right

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 thing to do, considering all of the
2 contributions that Plant Farley makes to the
3 state and local economy, as well as the local
4 Wiregrass Community.

5 We have been working on the license
6 renewal process since 2001. We've been
7 involved in this project for some time and
8 there's a tremendous amount of work that goes
9 on. Not only in the environmental review but
10 in other parts of the license renewal process
11 which you will not be seeing here today.

12 I do believe the report summary of which
13 you heard today demonstrates the same
14 conclusions we reached. The impact of the
15 renewal is small and certainly acceptable for
16 the renewal period.

17 People that operate and maintain Plant
18 Farley reside in the local area. This area
19 is home to them and their families. They try
20 to be good citizens and good environmental
21 stewards. They are committed to being a good
22 neighbor while we carry out our mission to
23 generate electric power for this area of the
24 country.

25 We think we make a significant

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 contribution to the local and state economy,
2 as well as to the quality of life in this
3 area by supplying electric power.

4 Availability of our product effects
5 homes, schools, hospitals and businesses. It
6 touches many people. Therefore, we think we
7 have a mission that promotes improvement in
8 the quality of life.

9 I want to thank all of our neighbors who
10 have continued to support us. We appreciate
11 the confidence you have placed in us and we
12 will work hard to continue to earn your
13 trust.

14 We certainly do have an impact on the
15 local economy, on the environment and on the
16 local area as far as civic organizations,
17 charitable groups and community involvement
18 are concerned.

19 We believe our employees participate in
20 many efforts that help make the local economy
21 and local community better.

22 In addition to our being good
23 environmental stewards, we're significant
24 contributors to the community. I also
25 believe that Plant Farley provides safe,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 secure and reliable electric power. It
2 contributes to an energy plan made up of
3 diverse sources. It is a viable and valuable
4 contributor to energy security.

5 I believe that license renewal is the
6 right thing to do. It's right for Plant
7 Farley and it's right for the local economy.

8 I appreciate the review the NRC has
9 provided. I believe that as time goes on we
10 will continue to demonstrate that we are good
11 environmental stewards of our facility and
12 surrounding environment. Thank you.

13 FACILITATOR ZALCMAN: Thank you, Mr.
14 Stinson. Next up, Mr. Walter Hill. Mr.
15 Walter Hill is from Wiregrass United Way.
16 And I will give you the floor.

1:32P

17 MR. HILL: It's my pleasure to be here
18 today and talk about other significant
19 contributions made by Plant Farley and the
20 employees out at Plant Farley.

21 Not only do I speak for myself, but we
22 have five board of directors, we're a five
23 county United Way, Coffeedale, Geneva, Henry
24 and Houston Counties, which have a hundred
25 board members in those five counties and then

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a board of trustees with representatives of
2 all five counties with thirty-two members.

3 In addition to that, I represent
4 thirty-six agencies ranging from American Red
5 Cross and Salvation Army to the Boys and
6 Girls Scouts, Boys and Girls Clubs, House of
7 Ruth and numerous other health and human
8 service agencies in the Wiregrass area.

9 To tell you briefly about the impact that
10 Farley as a corporation and Farley with its
11 employees have had, just in the last several
12 years we have had board members serve on at
13 least two of our county boards for Houston
14 and Henry Counties. We've had board chairs
15 that have been Farley employees, numerous
16 committee chairs representing our nominating
17 committee, planning committee and most
18 importantly our campaign chairs, as well as
19 numerous volunteers on our funds
20 distribution, which is a very important part
21 of what we do because not only do we spend a
22 lot of time raising money but we spend a
23 great deal of time determining how that money
24 is distributed. And that takes a lot of work
25 and those volunteers that have been involved

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 with Farley have been very dedicated to that
2 process.

3 And of course, they have a tremendous
4 impact financially on our campaign each year
5 raising just over the last several years
6 hundreds and hundreds of thousand of dollars.

7 Last year alone was over a hundred and
8 fifty-six thousand dollars out of the 3.2
9 million that we raised in this five county
10 area, the majority of that coming from
11 payroll deduction from employees but also
12 corporate donation, as well.

13 And then on top of that has been the
14 leadership positions that have just been
15 important not only as I mentioned to our
16 organization but to the agencies that we
17 represent, the thirty-six different agencies,
18 as well as numerous other agencies. Those
19 agencies -- almost every agency today has a
20 volunteer or a board member that's an
21 employee out at Farley and many of them have
22 leadership positions, people on their
23 executive committee or officers that are
24 employees at Farley. And they have a
25 tremendous impact on our community and in so

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 many different ways. And I wanted to make
2 sure that I took the opportunity to thank
3 them today and to let you know the impact
4 that they have on our community.

5 FACILITATOR ZALCMAN: Thank you very
6 much, Mr. Hill. Now it's an opportunity for
7 those of you that have thoughts or insights
8 or would like the moment to share some views
9 with us, we're happy to give you the podium
10 or give you the microphone.

11 Okay. Let me indicate that the meeting
12 will be coming to a close. We will have
13 another meeting tonight. Open house begins at six
14 o'clock. Public meeting again at seven
15 o'clock.

16 Before I hand it over to Mr. Kugler to
17 wrap it up for us, let me just indicate the
18 staff will still be here after the meeting.
19 We still have some of the open house material
20 in the back so make sure if you do want a
21 copy of the documents you can take it with
22 you. Or if you want to chat with any of us
23 that are here from the staff, particularly
24 the environmental review team, the resident
25 inspector or the safety project manager, we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 will stay, as well.

2 MR. KUGLER: Well, I would just like to
3 thank everyone again for coming out to our
4 meeting today. Your participation in this
5 process is very important to us.

6 If you do have comments on the Draft
7 Environmental Impact Statement, we ask you to
8 submit them in any form that Jack explained
9 and that you prefer. We will be accepting
10 those comments through November 5th. Jack is
11 our main point of contact.

12 I did want to mention again the meeting
13 feedback forms that were in the package of
14 papers you received when you came in. We
15 appreciate any comments we get on those
16 forms. Anything you can tell us that would
17 help us to serve you better in these meetings
18 we would appreciate that. And you can either
19 drop it off in the back, if you want to fill
20 it out now or if you want to fill it out
21 later you can mail it in. It's prepaid
22 postage so you can send it in by mail.

23 As Barry mentioned, the NRC staff and our
24 contractor will be staying after the meeting
25 and if you want to talk to any of us we would

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 be happy to do that.

2 Other than that, again, I thank you all
3 for coming and I guess we're adjourned.

4 Thank you.

5 FACILITATOR ZALCMAN: With that, we'll
6 close the record on the afternoon meeting.

7 Thank you very much.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 (Whereupon the meeting was concluded)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25